

1 AROCLES AGUILAR, SBN 94753
2 CHRISTINE JUN HAMMOND, SBN 206768
3 CHRISTOFER C. NOLAN, SBN 229542
4 California Public Utilities Commission
5 505 Van Ness Avenue
6 San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 703-2682
Facsimile: (415) 703-4592
cjh@cpuc.ca.gov

7 Attorneys for the California Public Utilities Commission and
8 Marybel Batjer, Martha Guzman Aceves, Clifford Rechtschaffen,
Genevieve Shiroma, and Darcie Houck in their official capacities as
9 Commissioners of the California Public Utilities Commission

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

13
14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
15 Plaintiff,
16 vs.
17 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,
18 Defendant.

Case No. 14-cr-00175-WHA

**MOTION OF THE CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
FOR LEAVE TO FILE CORRECTION
TO LETTER DATED MARCH 19, 2021
(ECF 1349)**

Hearing Date: March 23, 2021
Time: 8:00 am
Courtroom: 12, 19th Floor
Judge: Hon. William H. Alsup

28 **CPUC MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE CORRECTION TO LETTER DATED MARCH 19, 2021
(ECF 1349)**

Case No. 14-CR-00175-WHA

1 The California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) hereby seeks leave of the Court to
2 file the attached letter making a correction to the CPUC’s *Amicus* letter to the Court dated
3 March 19, 2021 (ECF 1349). Federal courts have inherent authority to entertain Amicus
4 briefs. *In re Bayshore Ford Truck Sales, Inc.*, 471 F.3d 1233, 1249, n.34 (11th Cir. 2006).

5 The CPUC’s correcting letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

6

7

Respectfully submitted,

8

9

March 23, 2021

By: /s/ Christine Jun Hammond
AROCLES AGUILAR
CHRISTINE JUN HAMMOND
CHRISTOFER C. NOLAN

10

11

12

Attorneys for the CALIFORNIA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**CPUC MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE CORRECTION TO LETTER DATED MARCH 19, 2021
(ECF 1349)**

Case No. 14-CR-00175-WHA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

**CPUC MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE CORRECTION TO LETTER DATED MARCH 19, 2021
(ECF 1349)**
Case No. 14-CR-00175-WHA

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GAVIN NEWSOM Governor

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



March 23, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Honorable William H. Alsup
United States District Court
Northern District of California
Courtroom 12 - 19th Floor
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

*Re: Proposed Probation Conditions 11 and 12 in Case No. 14-cr-00175-WHA;
California Public Utilities Commission's Corrections to Letter Dated March 19, 2021
(ECF 1349)*

Dear Judge Alsup,

The California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) requests leave of the Court to make a correction to its comments offered to the court on March 19, 2021. See ECF No. 1349. The CPUC sincerely apologizes for its overstatement that Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (“PG&E”) estimates of customer impacts flowing from its envisioned implementation of modified Proposed Conditions 11 and 12 would result in a “potential doubling of Public Safety Power Shutoff (“PSPS”) events in PG&E’s service territory.” ECF 1349 at 4 of 7; see also ECF 1349 at 5 of 7 (“... would have more than doubled the total number of PSPS events conducted in PG&E’s service territory.”). The CPUC wishes to correct this error and present the Court with more precise and correct statements as soon as it realized these inappropriately unqualified statements.

The correct characterization of PG&E’s estimates of customer impacts as a result of implementing modified Proposed Conditions 11 and 12 is that it would have resulted in a potential doubling of PSPS events in some of the counties in PG&E’s service territory.

As can be determined from materials PG&E provided to CPUC staff, see CPUC’s March 22, 2021 response to ECF 1355 at Exhibit 4 (presentation entitled, “Distribution HFTD Lidar Vegetation Criteria for Potential Inclusion in PG&E Distribution PSPS Criteria”), modified Proposed Conditions 11 and 12 would have produced an average less than double increase in PSPS events had they been applied in the 2010-2019 timeframe. Slide 4 of PG&E’s presentation shows a baseline of 27 PSPS events (see first row of third column entitled, “PSPS Total Events – 10 Year”), which means that a doubling of PSPS events would equal 54 PSPS events. According to PG&E’s estimates, however, after PG&E adds the 70th+ percentile grid cells out of the LiDAR data in High Fire Threat Districts, the baseline number of

Hon. William H. Alsup
March 23, 2021
Page 2

PSPS events changes to 45 (see second row of third column). Thus, had PG&E applied the modified Proposed Conditions of Probation 11 and 12 to the study time period, the average number of PSPS events in its entire service area would have increased by 67%, as captured in the fourth column of PG&E's presentation (entitled, "% increase from Baseline – PSPS Total Events 10 Year").

At the same time, according to PG&E's estimates, in some counties the total number of PSPS events over the study period 2010-2019 would have more than doubled. Slide 5 of PG&E's presentation shows estimated total PSPS events over the 10-year period by county had modified Proposed Conditions 11 and 12 been applied. The total number of PSPS events would have more than tripled over the 10-year period in Trinity County, and would have more than doubled in the Counties of Placer, Shasta, Tehama, Madera, and Mendocino. (See Slide 5, table on the left, comparing counties' "base" vs. "70th"). The total number of PSPS events would have been close to double in the Counties of Butte, Nevada, and El Dorado, while in other counties, the total number would have been significant (Counties of Yuba and Sierra and others).

The CPUC thanks the Court for allowing for these corrections to its letter of March 19, 2021

Sincerely,

/s/ Christine Jun Hammond
AROCLES AGUILAR
CHRISTINE JUN HAMMOND
CHRISTOFER NOLAN

Attorneys for the
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2
3 I am a citizen of the United States, over 18 years of age, employed in the City and
4 County of San Francisco, California, and not a party to the subject cause. My business
5 address is the California Public Utilities Commission, Legal Division, 505 Van Ness
6 Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102.

7 On March 23, 2021, I sent the following document:

8 **1. MOTION OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES**
9 **COMMISSION FOR LEAVE TO FILE CORRECTION TO LETTER**
10 **DATED MARCH 19, 2021 (ECF 1349)**

11 to the following interested parties by email:

12 Maria Severson, Esq.
13 Michael J. Aguirre, Esq.
14 Email: mseverson@amslawyers.com
15 Email: maguirre@amslawyers.com

16 Reid J. Schar
rschar@jenner.com

17 Kate Dyer
kdyer@clarencedyer.com

18 Kevin J. Orsini
korsini@cravath.com

19 jeffrey.b.schenk@usdoj.gov
20 hallie.hoffman@usdoj.gov
21 [Noah.Stern@usdoj.gov](mailto>Noah.Stern@usdoj.gov)
22 CaseView.ECF@usdoj.gov
23 philip.guentert@usdoj.gov
24 philip.kopczynski@usdoj.gov

25 ehairston@orrick.com
26 wbrown@orrick.com

27 ashearer@clarencedyer.com
28 bhauck@jenner.com

CPUC MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE CORRECTION TO LETTER DATED MARCH 19, 2021
(ECF 1349)

Case No. 14-CR-00175-WHA

1 RMeherberg@jenner.com

2 sjaffer@clarencedyer.com

3 christine.hammond@cpuc.ca.gov

4 christofer.nolan@cpuc.ca.gov

5 csandoval@scu.edu

6 William_Noble@cand.uscourts.gov

7
8 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

9 Executed on March 23, 2021, at San Francisco, California.

10
11 By: /s/ *Christine Jun Hammond* _____
12 AROCLES AGUILAR
13 CHRISTINE JUN HAMMOND
14 CHRISTOFER C. NOLAN

15
16
17 Attorneys for the CALIFORNIA PUBLIC
18 UTILITIES COMMISSION